

Attorney Docket No. YOR920000318US1

REMARKS

The present application was filed on January 5, 2001 with claims 1-22. Claims 1-22 remain pending and claims 1, 10, 21 and 22 are independent.

In the outstanding final Office Action dated June 24, 2005, the Examiner: (i) rejected claims 1-4, 8-13, 17-19, 21 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Applicants' Admitted Prior Art (hereinafter "AAPA"); and (ii) rejected claims 5, 14 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,484,247 to Gendron et al. (hereinafter "Gendron").

With regard to the rejection of claims 1-4, 8-13, 17-19, 21 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by AAPA, Applicants assert that such claims are patentable for at least the reasons presented below. Claims 1, 10, 21 and 22 have been amended to recite that the software package preparation is based on: (i) policy data indicating which of the one or more regions are candidates for receiving the software package; (ii) dependency information indicating requisites for a service provided by the software package; and (iii) configuration information for each of the candidate regions. Additionally, independent claims 1, 10, 21 and 22 have been amended to recite that the software package customization is based on: (i) regional distribution policies; (ii) dependency information specific to one or more roles performed by the target machines in that region; and (iii) individual target machine configuration information. Applicants assert that independent claims 1, 10, 21 and 22 are patentable for at least these reasons.

In accordance with the Examiner's suggestion in the Advisory Action, the specifics of the policy data, dependency data and configuration data are now explicitly recited in the independent claims, distinguishing the claims over AAPA.

Applicants assert that dependent claims 2-4, 8, 9, 11-13, and 17-19 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency from independent claims 1 and 10. Further, Applicants assert that dependent claims 2-4, 8, 9, 11-13, and 17-19 recite patentable subject matter in their own right. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-4, 8-13, 17-19, 21 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is therefore respectfully requested.

Attorney Docket No. YOR920000318US1

With regard to the rejection of claims 5, 14 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA and Gendron, Applicants assert that such claims are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency from independent claims 1 and 10. Further, Applicants assert that dependent claims 5, 14 and 20 recite patentable subject matter in their own right. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 5, 14 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is therefore respectfully requested.

In view of the above, Applicants believe that claims 1-22 are in condition for allowance, and respectfully request withdrawal of the §102(b) and §103(a) rejections.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: October 24, 2005

Robert W. Griffith
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 48,956
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
90 Forest Avenue
Locust Valley, NY 11560
(516) 759-4547